

Remarks

For the Drawings:

This Office Action objects to the drawings. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the drawings fail to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the Office Action concludes that the depletion of the first pattern, second pattern and/or conductive lines when brought into contact with the conductive material must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).

This Amendment modifies independent claims 1, 8, and 14 and cancels claim 20 to remove from the claims those features allegedly not shown in the drawings. Since these features are canceled from the claims, the drawings are not being amended.

For the Claims:

Applicant submitted claims 1-34. This Office Action rejects claims 8-13, 21-23, and 25-34 and objects to claims 1-7, 14-20, and 24. Applicant cancels claims 20-34, amends claims 1, 4, 8, and 14, and retains claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9-13, and 15-19 as previously submitted. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

This Office Action objects to claims 1, 4, 14, and 20 because there appears to exist inadvertent typographical errors in the claims. Claims 1, 4, 14, and 20 are being modified in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. As to claim 1, line 15, "printing the a second ink" is being amended to recite "printing a second ink." As to claim 4, line 1, "wherein printing is

AMENDMENT

SERIAL NO. 10/784,088

Page: 8

performed" is being amended to recite "wherein the printing is performed." As to claim 14, line 18, "the pliable dressing material is to be applied to an area of damaged" is being amended to recite "the pliable dressing material is adapted to be applied to an area of damaged." As to claim 20, line 4, "to expose to the" is being amended to recite "exposed to the." Applicant believes that modifications to claims 1, 4, 14, and 20 overcome the objections to claims 1, 4, 14, and 20. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to claims 1, 4, 14, and 20.

The Office Action alleges that should claims 21 and 22 be found allowable, claims 29 and 30 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. Claims 21, 22, 29, and 30 are being canceled. Accordingly, this potential objection is not relevant.

This Office Action rejects claims 8-13 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for allegedly omitting essential elements. The Office Action indicates that Applicant claims that the second element includes a different metal species than the first element, however it has not been specified that the first element includes a metal species. Since claims 9-13 depend from claim 8, the deficiencies of claim 8 are imputed to all dependent claims.

This Amendment amends claim 8 to more distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, claim 8 is being amended to include the additional limitation of "the first element includes a metal species." Applicant believes the modification to claim 8 overcomes the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Likewise, the modification to claim 8 overcomes the rejections of

AMENDMENT

SERIAL NO. 10/784,088

Page: 9

claims 9-13 by reason of dependency. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Regarding claim 24, the Office Action alleges that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the pattern." Claim 24 is being canceled. As such the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is no longer relevant.

Accordingly, this Amendment cancels claims 20-34, and amends claims 1, 4, 8, and 14. Currently amended claims 1, 4, 8, and 14 remain in the application and are believed to be allowable. In addition, claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9-13, and 15-19 remain in the application as previously submitted and are believed to be allowable.

Applicant believes that the foregoing amendments and remarks are fully responsive to the rejections and/or objections recited in the 12 March 2007 Office Action and that the present application is now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Lowell W. Gresham
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 31,165

Lowell W. Gresham
5727 North Seventh Street
Suite 409
Phoenix, AZ 85014
(602) 274-6996